Reviewer2:
Comments and Suggestions for Authors

The authors have made an interesting manuscript, but one that has some deficiencies to address, which requires further revision.

The introduction is adequate, but the results already show some deficiencies that must be corrected.

For example, in figure 1 A-D, the authors only put a photograph of liver staining, but did not indicate the values obtained for each condition studied with mean and standard deviation, and the corresponding statistical analysis. For example, in Figure 1E, the authors indicate the standard deviation and its statistical analysis, but in no case indicate the n of each condition, and it is an important piece of information that should appear in tables and graphs, and that can be complemented with images such as have made, that they are representative of each experimental condition. Perhaps the value of n can be omitted, but material and methods should appear in the manuscript before results, and the values of n should be indicated. The absence of the value of n is repeated in figure 2, 3, ...

Ans: As per your comment, we have modified the legend and added the n in the material and methods.

There are also errors in the naming of some genes, such as SREBP which appears four times as SERBP, as for example in figure 4.

Ans: Thanks for the comment, we have removed the discrepancy in the abbreviation.

On the other hand, there are too many figures, and perhaps figure 6, in which no significant difference appears, should go to supplementary material, and in this way facilitate the reading of the manuscript, since from my point of view that information is not relevant. , in addition to being incomplete due to the absence of the value of n. Perhaps the ALT value may have significant differences and it may be an omission of the authors that is difficult to specify, but there is a very large standard deviation, which with low n values may lack statistical significance, such as n = 5 that they use the authors.

Ans: We have moved Figure 6 to supplementary material accordingly.

Regarding the discussion, it should be elaborated in more detail, and if it is indicated that there are values that correlate, they can show a point cloud graph to check if the individual values really correlate or not.

For all this, the manuscript must be critically rewritten by the authors in order to be sent to this journal again.

Ans: As per your comment, the results are elaborated in detail and the discussion also.